DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 261 HE 018 326

AUTHOR	Levitz, Randi S.; Noel, Lee
TITLE	Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners. Summary Report of a Nationwide Survey.
INSTITUTION	American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa. National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	34p.; For the full report, see HE 018 325. Appendix B (the survey instrument) contains small print.
AVAILABLE FROM	The American College Testing Program, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, IA 52243 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Advising; *Academic Persistence; *Adult Students; Ancillary School Services; Curriculum Development; Higher Education; Marketing; Prior Learning; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; *School Holding Power; School Orientation; School Schedules; School Surveys; Skill Development; Student Financial Aid; *Student Recruitment

ABSTRACT

Results of a national survey, "Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners" (ARAL), by the American College Testing Program are summarized. Attention is focused on programs and services that have been successful with adult learners. ARAL respondents were from three types of institutions: (1) those for whom adult learners represent a primary thrust of their institutions; (2) those for whom adult learners represent a new but growing clientele and who are interested in providing or expanding adult-focused programs; and (3) those who have little experience with adult learners but are interested in adults as potential students, and who plan to modify, expand, or create programs and services in order to attract this population. Data for each type of institution are provided on: mean adult and total enrollments; definitions of adults; reasons adults drop out; programs, services, and activities for adults; number and percent of program categories ranked most essential; number of program description forms returned; mean ranked satisfaction of program category; mean ranked effectiveness of program category; mean ranked effectiveness for target group. Information is also provided on stratification and sample sizes for the general sample. The ARAL questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners

Summary Report of a Nationwide Survey

Randi S. Levitz
Lee Noel

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American College Testing Program

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© The American College Testing Program

©1980 by The American College Testing Program. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

List of Tables v
Acknowledgments vii
Background 1
Methodology 2
Findings 3
Conclusions 7
Summary 8
Tables 9
Appendix A: Sampling Procedures 23
Appendix B: The ARAL Survey Instrument 25

List of Tables

Table 1. Respondents by Type of Institution 9

Table 2. Mean Adult and Total Enrollments by Type of Institution 9

Table 3. Definition of Adult by Type of Institution 10

Table 4. Reasons Adults Drop Out by Type of Institution 11

Table 5. Definition of Adult Dropouts by Type of Institution 12

Table 6. Programs, Services, and Activities for Adults by Type of Institution 13

Table 7. Number and Percent of Program Categories Ranked Most Essential 14

Table 8. Weighted Rankings of Most Essential Program Areas 15

Table 9. Number of Program Description Forms Returned by Type of Institution 16

Table 10. Institutions That Submitted Five or More Program Description Forms 17

Table 11. Mean Ranked Satisfaction of Program Category by Type of Institution 18

Table 12. Mean Ranked Satisfaction for Target Group by Type of Institution 19

Table 13. Mean Ranked Effectiveness of Program Category by Type of Institution 20

Table 14. Mean Ranked Effectiveness for Target Group by Type of Institution 21

Table 15. Stratification and Sample Sizes for General Sample 24

Acknowledgments

This publication is based on the findings of a nationwide survey, "Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners" (ARAL). The survey was designed to identify, analyze, and catalog campus practices that have been successful with adult learners. Special appreciation is extended to the survey directors for the design of the study and the construction of the survey instrument. Without their foresight, initiative, and thoughtful contributions, this publication would not have been possible. The following individuals served as ARAL survey directors:

Patricia Gartland
Assistant Vice President
Publications and Public Affairs

Lee G. Noel
Executive Director
ACT National Center for Educational Conferences

Pat Spratt
Administrative Assistant
ACT National Center for Educational Conferences

Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners

Background

Recently much attention has focused on adult learners as current or potential students in higher education. The involvement of adults in higher education today differs in two respects from their past involvement. First, the number of adults enrolled in higher education has increased significantly. According to recent census data, the proportion of individuals age 25 and older in total higher education enrollment has increased from 28% in 1972 to 33% in 1976; correspondingly, the proportion of college students age 17-24 has decreased from 72% to 67% during that period.[1] This percentage increase becomes even more significant when one considers that total enrollment in higher education increased by about three million students during the 1970s.[2]

Second, much of this new growth is due to increased enrollment by older than traditional-age students generally, and by women in particular. The rate of college enrollment by men age 25-34 increased from 11% in 1959, to 16% in 1969, to 17% in 1978. The rate of college enrollment by women age 25-34 increased from 2% in 1959, to 7% in 1969, to 14% in 1978. While comparable longitudinal data for individuals age 35 and older are not available for 1959 and 1969, recent enrollment data indicate that from 1972 to 1976 enrollment by that age group increased 51.9%—compared to 51.2% for the 30-34 age group, 37.2% for the 25-29 age group, and 13.9% for the under-25 age group.[3]

In addition, the number of potential adult learners will be even greater in the future as a result of the aging of the population in the United States. Population projections by age group from 1980 to 1990 indicate that the 25-34 age group will increase by 13%; the 35-44 age group will increase by 39%; and the 45-54 age group will increase by 12%. In contrast, the 18-24 age group will *decrease* by 15%.[4]

For many institutions, notably two-year public colleges, the adult learner group has always been considered a primary target group for institutional efforts. Only in recent years, however, have significant numbers of adult learners begun to take

---

[1]W. V. Grant and C. G. Lind, *Digest of Education Statistics* (Washington, D.C.: NCES, 1979), p. 97.

[2]J. Magarrell, "Enrollments," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 21 April 1980, p. 11.

[3]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstracts of the U.S.* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, 1970, 1979).

[4]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-25, no. 704 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 10.

advantage of the full range of postsecondary educational opportunities. Simultaneously, institutions have become interested in redefining programs and services to meet the needs of ever-more-prevalent adult learners. Despite these developments, little is generally known about the content of specific programs or their degree of success.

In late spring 1980, The American College Testing Program conducted a national survey whose aim was to determine the extent and kinds of strategies, programs, and services being used by American postsecondary institutions to attract and retain adult learners. The survey—entitled Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners (ARAL)—had three primary objectives:

1. To identify institutions that had taken positive and creative steps toward meeting the special needs of adult learners;
2. To describe the institutional innovations currently in use and to analyze the extent to which they are deemed both satisfactory and effective in that setting; and
3. To catalog descriptions of successful, innovative efforts and to create helpful resources for institutions newly acquainted with the needs of adult learners.

Two publications, intended to fulfill these objectives, have grown out of the ARAL survey: this ARAL **Summary Report** and the ARAL **Program Description Catalog.**

Methodology

Two samples of institutions were used in the ARAL Survey: 1) a national sample of postsecondary institutions (N = 1272), and 2) a high-interest sample of all institutions that had submitted an application in 1979 to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for funding of a demonstration project related to adult learners (N = 396). Since the two samples were drawn independently, 114 institutions appeared in both samples. When the samples were combined, 1554 (unduplicated) institutions were represented. (Detailed information on the sampling procedures is contained in Appendix A.)

In spring 1980, surveys were mailed to the presidents of institutions in the national sample and to the project director identified in the FIPSE application of institutions in the high-interest sample. Whenever an institution appeared in both samples, a copy of the survey was mailed to both the institutional president and the project director. If two surveys were returned from an institution, the responses were combined prior to the analysis of the data.

The survey questionnaire was designed to obtain information in several areas. The first section of the survey explored the extent to which the institution as a whole responded to adult learners. The second section solicited information on the nature of, and satisfaction with, specific programs, services, and activities for adult learners. Respondents were encouraged to provide detailed information on all exemplary, productive, and innovative institutional activities. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix B.

To date, 517 institutions have returned surveys—an overall response rate of 33%. In Table 1, respondents are displayed by institutional type. Responses from public institutions represent 54% of the returns; those from private institutions, 35%; and those from other types of institutions or those that did not identify their institutional type, 11%. Most surveys sent to national-sample institutions were routed to and completed by the department, program, or administrative unit with greatest responsibility for adult learners. In some instances the institution's president completed the survey; these responses came generally from institutions with relatively low enrollments or institutions where adult learners constitute the majority of the enrollment. Surveys sent to the high-interest sample of institutions were generally completed by the project director (as identified above). Current institutional efforts described in the findings below should not be viewed as definitive, inflexible solutions, but rather as models for developing innovative responses to particular local needs.

Findings

Table 2 displays mean adult and total enrollments by institutional type. Responding institutions were of small to moderate size, with mean full-time enrollment ranging from 420 for two-year private institutions to 5,692 for four-year public institutions. The ratio of adult full-time enrollment to total full-time enrollment ranged from 8% for four-year private institutions to 36% for two-year private institutions. The ratio of adult part-time enrollment to total part-time enrollment ranged from 32% for four-year public institutions to 60% for four-year private institutions.

Definition of Adult Learners

Table 3 displays the operational definitions of adult learners by institutional type. Two-year institutions were more likely than four-year institutions to consider all students adults or to rely on age 21 as the minimum age for an adult. Almost two-thirds of two-year public and private institutions consider individuals age 15 to 21 adults, compared to approximately one-third of four-year public and private institutions. In contrast, 29% of four-year private and 36% of four-year public institutions use age 25 as the minimum age for adult students. Among the responses categorized as "other" were the following behavioral definitions of adults: those who have adult responsibilities or commitments; those who are enrolled part-time or in off-campus extension or noncredit courses; those who are employed full-time. A small but significant percentage of institutions indicated that, at the time of the survey, adult enrollment at their institution was not yet significant enough to necessitate a working definition of adult learners.

Adult Attrition

Institutional self-studies frequently focus on general student attrition and its causes. The ARAL survey explored the extent to which institutions had directed attention specifically to the issue of adult attrition. Adult dropout studies had been conducted by only 77 out of 517 (or 15%) of the responding institutions. Two-year public institutions were more likely to have conducted adult dropout studies (21%) than were other types of institutions: among the four-year private institutions, 18% had conducted adult dropout studies—as compared to 14% of the two-year private

institutions, 8% of the four-year public institutions, and 15% of the other types of institutions.

Of the 77 institutions that conducted adult dropout studies, only 49 (or 10% of the 517 institutions participating in the study) attempted to calculate a dropout rate. As with studies of adult dropouts, two-year public and four-year private institutions were more likely to have attempted such a calculation. No findings from these studies are reported here because no clearcut pattern emerged, and because the data collection techniques used were too diverse to allow summary statements to be made. Furthermore, the diversity of the population defined as adult learners and the lack of standard definitions for adult dropouts added to the complexity of this task.

Table 4 displays reasons that administrators perceive as contributing to an adult's decision to drop out of college. While these data are based on 54 separate, uncontrolled, institution-based studies, some generalizations can be made from the findings. Conflict with job responsibilities or schedule was cited by more than two-thirds of two-year public institutions and by all two-year private institutions, by more than three-fifths of four-year private and other types of institutions, and by almost one-half of four-year public institutions. Conflicts with home, family, or child-care responsibilities were noted by two-thirds of two-year private institutions, by 55% of four-year private institutions, by 40% of two-year public institutions, and by 27% of four-year public institutions. In contrast, problems with finances were cited most often by four-year private or other types of institutions as the reason adults drop out of college. Individual concerns (lack of motivation, change in educational objectives) and course offerings that were inadequate or inappropriate to personal educational objectives were cited frequently by all types of institutions. Among responses included in the "other" category were: personal reasons; problems with transportation; lack of energy; and insufficient study time. It is important to note that imaginative, personal, and programmatic interventions by the institution will be required in order to counter the factors that frequently contribute to adult attrition.

Definitions of adult dropouts were provided by 88 out of 517 (17%) of the institutions. Table 5 displays definitions of adult dropouts by type of institution. Most institutions based their definitions on observation: adults stopped attending classes in mid-semester; finished a semester's work but did not register the following semester, or after a specified number of semesters; or did not complete the planned program of study. Only a few institutions defined adult dropout as an individual who had formally withdrawn from the institution.

Although only a small number of institutions have conducted adult dropout studies, defined adult dropouts, and determined adult dropout rates, those institutions should be placed in the vanguard. Institutional self-study is an important component of program development, and as adult learner enrollments increase, it is expected that a greater percentage of institutions will necessarily involve themselves in self-study activities.

Campus Programs and Activities

Information about new or modified programs, services, or activities for adults was solicited in two ways. Respondents were given a list of twenty program categories

and were instructed to indicate which of these had been introduced or restructured in an attempt to attract or retain adult learners. Later in the survey, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on effective programs, services, and activities.

Table 6 shows the percentage of institutions, by type, that indicated efforts in each of the program categories. From 41% to 72% of all two-year and four-year public and private institutions indicated that special efforts had been made for adults in the areas of marketing, admissions, counseling, registration, scheduling, financial aid, and course offerings. The categories in which the least institutional effort had been expended were: student services (adult student center, provision of a day care facility); faculty development; program evaluation; and funding (inducing corporations to pay employees' tuition, or creating an alumni fund for adult programs).

What Works with Adult Learners

Institutions that implemented or altered campus programs and activities to meet the needs of adult learners were then asked to rank order the five program categories that they deemed the "most essential and productive" on their campus. Table 7 displays the number and percent of total responses of the five top-rated program categories in each of five response groups (from most essential to fifth most essential). Identification of a most essential and productive program was provided by 77% of respondents; 75% provided a response to second most essential; 72% to third; 66% to fourth; and 61% to fifth.

The proportion of adults in the total enrollment most certainly influences an institution's perception of the importance of programs directed specifically toward adult learners. For example, an institution that has an enrollment comprised largely of traditional-age students, but that also has always had a small but stable adult enrollment, is more likely to be interested in orientation and retention programs than in marketing and recruitment.

Table 8 displays weighted rankings (a score of 5 was assigned to most essential, a 4 to second most essential, a 3 to third most essential, and so forth) of the program areas designated most essential by respondents. The areas of scheduling, marketing, and administrative structure received the highest weighted rankings. The relative rankings displayed in Table 8 should be viewed within the context of the data presented in Table 7.

Adult students with little or no prior college experience, or those who return to college after a prolonged absence, are likely to require special institutional services, programs, or support to enable them to persist until completion of their educational objectives. Detailed information on especially productive or innovative institutional programs, services, and activities for adult learners was obtained through the use of program description forms. (A sample of the form is included in the ARAL survey, reproduced in Appendix B). Sixty-one percent of the responding institutions (316 out of 517) submitted a total of 782 program description forms. Table 9 displays the number of program description forms received by institutional type. Program description forms were submitted by more than two-thirds of four-year public institutions, by more than one-half of two-year public and four-year private institutions, and by about one-third of two-year private institutions. The majority of two-year public, two-year private, and four-year private institutions submitted one

form; however, 28% of two-year public and 36% of four-year public institutions submitted more than one form. Table 10 displays, in alphabetical order, the names of the institutions that submitted five or more program descriptions forms.

Through a content analysis of the program description forms, the program category list was expanded to include twenty-six categories and twenty target groups. Institutions were asked to rank each program—on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)—according to both satisfaction and effectiveness. Table 11 displays the mean ranked satisfaction for program categories by institutional type. The program areas that received a mean ranking of 4.0 or higher were: admissions; registration; financial aid; course offerings; curricular innovations; administration; skill development; and unique off-campus class locations. Differences in satisfaction were noted by institutional type: respondents from two-year public institutions expressed the greatest satisfaction (mean ranking of 4.5 or higher) with programs in the areas of admissions, registration, curricular innovations, assessment of prior learning, funding, and in meeting the needs of reentry and first-entry adult students. Four-year public institutions expressed the greatest satisfaction with programs in the areas of registration, administration, personal development, educational brokering, day care, and off-campus course locations. Four-year private institutions noted the greatest satisfaction with programs in the areas of admissions, registration, career planning, faculty development, administration, and off-campus course locations. Among two-year private institutions, no program category earned a mean ranking of 4.5 or higher.

In Table 12, the mean ranked satisfaction for programs is displayed by target group and by institutional type. Two-year public institutions expressed the greatest satisfaction (4.5 or greater mean ranking) with programs targeted toward members of minority groups and those who had attended the institution at one time but had withdrawn. Two-year private, four-year public, and four-year private institutions reported the most satisfaction with programs aimed at individuals interested in mid-career advancement. Additionally, four-year public institutions assigned high rankings to programs geared to the needs of full-time enrolled adults and veterans or military personnel. Four-year private institutions were most satisfied with programs created for part-time and full-time enrolled adults, public school teachers and administrators, reentry students, and members of minority groups.

Table 13 displays the mean ranked effectiveness of program category by type, and Table 14 presents parallel data for target groups. For the most part, effectiveness rankings are lower than satisfaction rankings. Respondents indicated that while the program had met objectives, they were certain that with specific modifications it could be even more successful. However, the total mean effectiveness rankings were the same as, or higher than, the satisfaction rankings for the following program areas: career planning; placement; course offerings; curricular innovations; faculty development; skill development; program evaluation; and funding. The total mean effectiveness rankings were the same as, or higher than, the satisfaction ratings for the program directed toward the following target groups: full-time adult students; public school administrators and teachers; individuals interested in mid-career advancement; unemployed individuals; reentry students; students currently enrolled; veterans and other military personnel; individuals in need of professional certification; and former students who had withdrawn from the institution. Addi-

tional comments about effectiveness of programs included the following: the program is still in the developmental stage; the program has not yet reached full potential; funding is not sufficient to allow for needed adjustments; further institutional support from faculty and administration is necessary; marketing of the program has been inadequate.

Conclusions

Respondents to the ARAL survey were from institutions that fall into three classes: (1) those for whom adult learners represent a primary thrust of their institutions (as expressed in their mission statement) and who are interested in describing effective existing programs and services; (2) those for whom adult learners represent a new but growing clientele and who are interested in providing or expanding adult-focused programs; and (3) those who have little experience with adult learners but are interested in adults as potential students, and who plan to modify, expand or create programs and services in order to attract adult learners. The majority of responses received were from institutions that fall into categories two and three.

Here, in brief, are the main conclusions and recommendations drawn from the ARAL survey:

- Two-year institutions are likely to consider all enrollees as adult learners, while four-year institutions are more likely to use age 25 or older to define that group.
- A small but significant percentage of institutions has begun to study adult attrition—one of the first steps in a program to improve retention. When designing adult dropout studies, it is recommended that they *not* be patterned directly on studies used for traditional-age students (which generally use program or degree completion as a measure), but rather that they measure adult attrition against the specific educational objectives of individuals.
- A small but significant proportion of responding institutions expressed the opinion that marketing was the program area that they felt to be the most essential and productive. Marketing is seen by some to be a natural first step; there are, however, other equally important initial contact areas. They include the provision of services in the following areas: career planning—in order that individual educational objectives can be designed to mesh with career goals; orientation—because once adult learners are successfully integrated into the campus environment, their chances of persisting to meet their objectives are improved; counseling—in order to help adult learners cope with first entry or reentry apprehensions; and flexible class scheduling options—to enable adults to successfully mesh their studies with job, home, and family responsibilities.
- Program areas that received total mean rankings of 4.0 and higher for both institutional satisfaction and effectiveness were: admissions; registration; course offerings; curricular innovations; administration; program evaluation; peer interaction; and unique off-campus course locations. Programs targeted towards the following groups received total mean rankings of 4.0 and higher for both institutional satisfaction and effectiveness: full-time students; individuals interested in mid-career advancement; first-entry and reentry students; veterans and other military personnel; individuals interested in professional certification; and former students who have withdrawn from the institution. Ranked satisfaction

with and effectiveness of programs varied greatly by institutional type and program category. These data, presented in Tables 11-14, may be helpful to institutions that are trying to put in priority order their plans for implementation or expansion of programs for adult learners.

Summary

The adult learner population is growing faster than virtually any other segment of higher education. The potential for continued growth, especially in community-based institutions, is nearly limitless. It has been estimated that 40,000,000 adults have an interest in additional organized study. To convert this interest to participation, institutions must become more responsive to the personnel and educational needs of adult learners.

The ARAL survey was designed to identify and highlight the successful campus practices already established for adult learners. The existing activities—described in the findings of this report and in the ARAL *Program Description Catalog*—reflect *what is happening* today but should not necessarily be interpreted as *what ought to be happening* for the expanding population of adult learners.

The needs and circumstances of every community—indeed, every campus—are different. Once institutions have made a conscious decision to serve the adult clientele, they must then concern themselves with providing the personal and programmatic interventions that are often unique to adults. The findings of the ARAL survey are not presented for uncritical adoption on individual campuses. Rather, they are offered in the hope that institutions might be prompted to study local conditions and then adapt the innovations that will best serve adults on their campuses during the 1980s.

TABLE

Respondents by Type of Institution

	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other[a]	Total
Number	112	22	168	160	55	517
Percent	22%	4%	32%	31%	11%	100%

[a]Or type not defined.

TABLE 2

Mean Adult and Total Enrollments by Type of Institution

	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
Adult Full-time Enrollment	374	153	953	124	135
(N)	(112)	(22)	(168)	(160)	(45)
Total Full-time Enrollment	1508	420	5692	1487	911
(N)	(111)	(21)	(149)	(156)	(42)
Adult Part-time Enrollment	1123	223	829	507	613
(N)	(110)	(22)	(168)	(160)	(45)
Total Part-time Enrollment	2309	605	2578	850	1087
(N)	(109)	(22)	(166)	(159)	(45)
Adult Full-time Enrollment as Percentage of Total Full-time Enrollment	25%	36%	17%	8%	15%
Adult Part-time Enrollment as Percentage of Total Part-time Enrollment	49%	37%	32%	60%	56%

TABLE 3

Definition of Adult by Type of Institution
(In Percentages)

	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
N =	112	22	168	160	55
All Students Adults	31	27	16	11	25
21	31	36	17	21	29
22-24	3	0	5	11	5
25	18	27	36	29	4
30	<1	0	0	1	0
2-5 Year Gap in Education	0	0	2	3	0
>5 Year Gap in Education	0	0	0	1	4
No Definition	8	5	7	9	2
Other	6	0	12	9	11
No Response	2	5	5	5	20

TABLE 4

Reasons Adults Drop Out by Type of Institution
(In Percentages)

	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
N =	23	3	11	22	5
Financial Problems	26	33	36	68	100
Individual Concerns	26	0	18	23	0
Home/Family Responsibilities	40	67	27	55	0
Conflict with Job Responsibilities	70	100	45	64	60
Moving from Area	26	33	27	32	20
Insufficient Academic Progress	9	33	0	5	0
Inadequate Course Offerings	13	33	27	0	60
Illness	22	0	0	5	0
Other	43	33	82	5	100
N of institutions not included above that had conducted a dropout study but didn't report reasons for attrition	1	0	3	6	3

Note. Up to 4 responses possible per institution

TABLE 5

Definition of Adult Dropouts by Type of Institution
(In Percentages)

	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
N =	26	5	15	32	10
Admitted, Never Registered	0	20	0	0	0
Registered, No Show	0	0	0	3	0
Stopped Attending Classes	12	0	20	9	20
Didn't Register for Subsequent Semester	31	0	13	28	20
Didn't Register after x Semesters	4	0	4	13	10
Didn't Complete Program	15	40	7	16	5
Official Withdrawal	19	40	7	6	0
Other	19	0	13	25	0

TABLE 6

Programs, Services, and Activities for Adults by Type of Institution
(In Percentages)

	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
N =	112	22	168	160	55
Marketing	71	54	60	49	45
Admissions	65	45	61	57	33
Orientation	40	32	49	42	22
Counseling	72	45	62	51	35
Registration	53	45	52	49	27
Advising	57	32	49	45	29
Scheduling	52	41	60	58	25
Student Services	41	5	36	26	16
Financial Aid	63	41	52	51	25
Career Planning	63	23	43	43	25
Placement	48	23	29	38	16
Course Offerings	49	41	60	46	42
Curricular Innovations	31	32	42	42	33
Faculty Development	37	23	17	19	16
Administrative Structure	28	18	37	33	22
Assessment Prior Learning	36	23	34	42	25
Skill Development	57	23	33	29	20
Program Evaluation	29	27	24	38	25
Funding	32	41	29	36	25
Institutional Support	51	36	51	49	35

Note. Institutions were encouraged to submit forms in as many categories as they had effective programs.

TABLE 7

Number and Percent of Program Categories Ranked Most Essential

	N	%
Most Essential		
Marketing	65	16
Scheduling	64	16
Counseling	33	8
Course Offering	31	8
Admissions	29	7
Total N Responses	397	
Second Most Essential		
Scheduling	56	14
Admissions	48	12
Counseling	40	10
Course Offerings	37	9
Marketing	37	9
Total N Responses	390	
Third Most Essential		
Admissions	45	12
Scheduling	37	10
Counseling	34	9
Registration	28	8
Academic Advising	25	7
Total N Responses	373	
Fourth Most Essential		
Admissions	30	9
Counseling	29	8
Orientation	28	8
Marketing	27	8
Course Offerings	27	7
Total N Responses	344	
Fifth Most Essential		
Institutional Support	26	8
Registration	24	8
Scheduling	23	7
Career Planning	23	7
Marketing	22	7
Total N Responses	313	

TABLE 8

Weighted Rankings of Most Essential Program Areas
(In Rank Order)

Class Scheduling (evening, weekend, intensive course formats)	3.6
Marketing, Recruitment, Outreach	3.5
Administrative Structure (key position or office that serves as advocate for adult students)	3.4
Counseling	3.3
Course Offerings	3.3
Admissions Materials and Procedures	3.3
Academic Advising Services	3.2
Curricular Innovations	3.2
Orientation Sessions and Activities	3.2
Assessment of Prior Learning	3.1
Institutional Support (mission statement, long-range planning highlights importance of adult student needs)	3.0
Financial Aid	2.8
Skill Development	2.8
Registration Procedures	2.6
Student Services and Activities (adult student center, day care center)	2.5
Career Planning	2.5
Placement Services	2.3
Funding (corporations pay employees' tuition, etc.)	2.3
Faculty Training and Development	2.2
Evaluation of Programs and Services	1.8

TABLE 9

Number of Program Description Forms Returned by Type of Institution
(In Percentages)

Number of Forms	N =	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
0		45	68	32	42	25
1		27	27	31	39	47
2		8	0	11	5	13
3		9	0	9	5	4
4		4	0	5	2	2
5		1	0	2	3	5
6-15		6	4	9	4	4

TABLE 10

Institutions That Submitted Five or More Program Description Forms

Name	City, State	N of Forms Submitted
Abilene Christian College Metrocenter	Garland, TX	10
Alverno College	Milwaukee, WI	7
Arizona State University	Tempe, AZ	6
Bee County College	Beeville, TX	7
Bellevue Community College	Bellevue, WA	11
Boston University	Boston, MA	6
Canisius College	Buffalo, NY	5
Chadron State College	Chadron, NE	7
Chattanooga State Technical Institute	Chattanooga, TN	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Technical College	Cheraw, SC	7
Cheyney State College	Cheyney, PA	7
College of Charleston	Charleston, SC	5
College of Lake County	Grayslake, IL	9
Cornell College	Mount Vernon, IA	14
Cumberland College	Lebanon, TN	7
Cumberland County College	Vineland, NJ	8
Delta State University	Cleveland, MS	9
Drake University	Des Moines, IA	13
Edinboro State College	Edinboro, PA	14
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford	Rutherford, NJ	5
Lower Columbia College	Longview, WA	7
Metropolitan State College	Denver, CO	11
Millsaps College	Jackson, MS	11
Morgan State College	Baltimore, MD	5
Mundelein College	Chicago, IL	5
Oregon College of Education	Monmouth, OR	9
Our Lady of the Lake College	San Antonio, TX	5
Roberts-Walsh Business School	Union, NJ	5
Russell Sage College	Troy, NY	9
Texas A & I University	Kingsville, TX	9
The Ohio State University	Columbus, OH	5
University of Arizona	Tucson, AZ	7
University of Cincinnati	Cincinnati, OH	12
University of Illinois	Urbana, IL	5
University of Louisville	Louisville, KY	8
University of Nebraska	Omaha, NE	10
Virginia State College	Petersburg, VA	5
Wesleyan University	Middletown, CT	8
West Liberty State College	West Liberty, WV	8
Winona State College	Winona, MN	6

TABLE 11

Mean Ranked Satisfaction of Program Category by Type of Institution

	N = Number of Program Forms in Category	Total Mean Ranking for Category	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
Campus/Class Location	6	4.8	4.0	0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Registration	31	4.6	4.5	4.0	4.6	4.7	5.0
Educational Brokering	2	4.5	0	0	4.5	0	0
Peer Interaction	7	4.4	4.0	0	4.3	0	5.0
Curricular Innovations	45	4.2	4.5	0	4.3	4.1	4.0
Admissions	38	4.2	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.6	4.3
Administrative Structure	19	4.2	4.0	0	4.5	4.7	4.0
Course Offerings	65	4.0	4.3	0	3.7	3.9	4.4
Financial A[illegible]	39	4.0	3.4	4.0	3.8	4.1	5.0
Skill Development	21	4.0	3.9	0	4.0	3.0	5.0
Counseling	67	3.9	3.9	3.0	3.7	4.1	4.0
Assessment Prior Learning	38	3.9	4.5	0	3.6	4.3	0
Student Services	18	3.9	4.4	0	3.6	3.7	0
Day Care	8	3.9	3.7	0	5.0	2.5	5.0
Orientation	55	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.8	4.2	4.5
Marketing	93	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.6	3.9	2.8
Scheduling	73	3.7	3.1	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.8
Advising	31	3.7	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	1.5
Program Evaluation	11	3.7	0	0	3.8	4.3	2.5
Student Needs	11	3.6	4.5	0	2.4	4.3	5.0
Funding	9	3.6	4.5	0	2.5	3.3	5.0
Career Planning	32	3.4	2.9	0	3.7	4.7	0
Faculty Development	10	3.4	3.5	0	3.7	5.0	0
Institutional Support	20	3.3	3.7	0	2.6	4.0	4.0
Placement	9	3.2	4.0	0	4.0	3.0	0
Personal Development	9	3.1	3.0	0	5.0	4.0	2.5
Number of programs for all categories	767[a]		156	13	318	204	60

Note. Satisfaction ranking is based on a scale of 5 (high) to 1 (low).

[a]The total N of program forms (767) is greater than row total N (751) due to the exclusion of responses from this table for which there was no information on institutional type.

TABLE 12

Mean Ranked Satisfaction for Target Group by Type of Institution

	N = Number of Program Forms in Target Group	Total Mean Ranking for Target Group	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
Full-time students	2	5.0	0	0	5.0	5.0	0
Minority/Ethnic	6	4.5	5.0	0	4.3	5.0	0
Mid-career Advancement	36	4.4	3.0	5.0	4.7	4.6	0
Veterans/Military	4	4.3	4.0	0	5.0	0	0
Students who have withdrawn	3	4.3	4.5	0	0	4.0	0
Women	49	4.2	4.3	0	3.6	4.4	4.0
First-time, no prior college	38	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.9	4.7
Professional Certification	16	4.2	4.3	0	4.3	4.0	4.3
Reentry, prior college	45	4.0	3.5	0	3.7	4.6	0
Part-time students	43	4.0	4.3	0	3.6	4.5	4.5
Adults	135	3.9	3.7	0	3.9	3.9	4.0
Public School Teachers/ Administrators	13	3.9	5.0	0	4.4	4.7	0
Not Currently Enrolled	116	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.9	4.0
Currently Enrolled	89	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7
Senior Citizens	32	3.8	4.0	0	3.5	3.8	4.5
High-Risk Admissions	20	3.8	4.1	0	4.4	2.5	0
Employed	66	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.3
Unemployed	5	3.4	3.3	0	0	4.0	0
Personal Development	10	3.2	2.3	4.0	4.3	2.7	0
Career Change	14	2.6	3.0	0	3.6	4.0	1.3
N of programs for all target groups	742[a]		154	13	303	201	57

[a]Total N of program forms; row total N = 726.

TABLE 13

Mean Ranked Effectiveness of Program Category by Type of Institution

	N = Number of Program Forms in Category	Total Mean Ranking for Category	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
Campus/Class Location	6	4.5	4.0	0	4.5	5.0	4.0
Registration	31	4.4	4.5	4.0	4.2	4.7	5.0
Peer Interaction	7	4.3	4.5	0	4.0	0	5.0
Curricular Innovations	45	4.2	4.8	0	4.3	3.7	4.0
Program Evaluation	11	4.2	0	0	3.8	4.3	5.0
Skill Development	21	4.1	4.4	0	3.3	3.0	4.7
Course Offerings	65	4.0	4.3	0	3.6	3.8	4.6
Admissions	38	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.8	4.6	4.3
Administrative Structure	19	4.0	2.5	0	4.5	4.5	4.0
Counseling	67	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.7	4.4	4.0
Scheduling	73	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.8
Financial Aid	39	3.7	3.4	4.0	3.3	3.9	5.0
Assessment Prior Learning	38	3.7	4.5	0	3.3	3.9	5.0
Advising	31	3.7	3.0	4.0	3.8	3.6	4.0
Student Services	18	3.7	3.9	0	3.4	4.3	0
Funding	9	3.7	4.5	0	2.5	3.5	5.0
Career Planning	32	3.6	3.7	0	3.6	4.5	0
Marketing	93	3.5	3.6	2.3	3.5	3.8	2.7
Orientation	55	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.8	4.5
Student Needs	11	3.5	4.0	0	2.2	4.7	5.0
Day Care	8	3.5	4.3	0	5.0	2.5	0
Placement	9	3.4	4.5	0	4.0	3.0	0
Institutional Support	20	3.2	3.7	0	2.5	4.0	4.0
Faculty Development	10	3.1	4.0	0	3.0	5.0	0
Personal Development	9	3.1	3.0	0	5.0	4.0	2.5
Educational Brokering	2	1.5	0	0	1.5	0	0
N of programs for all categories	767[a]		156	13	318	204	60

[a]Total N of program forms; row total N = 751.

TABLE 14

Mean Ranked Effectiveness for Target Group by Type of Institution

	N = Number of Program Forms in Target Group	Total Mean Ranking for Target Group	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Other
Full-time students	2	5.0	0	0	5.0	5.0	0
Mid-career Advancement	36	4.4	4.3	2.0	4.6	4.5	0
Unemployed	5	4.4	4.5	0	0	4.0	0
Professional Certification	16	4.3	4.5	0	4.3	4.0	4.3
Veterans/Military	4	4.3	4.0	0	5.0	0	0
Students who have withdrawn	3	4.3	4.5	0	0	4.0	0
Reentry, prior college	45	4.0	3.5	0	3.9	4.3	0
First-time, no prior college	38	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.7
Currently Enrolled	89	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.7	4.4
Public School Teachers/ Administrators	13	3.9	5.0	0	4.4	5.0	0
Women	49	3.8	3.3	0	3.5	4.5	1.5
Minority/Ethnic	6	3.8	5.0	0	2.7	5.0	0
Adults	135	3.7	3.5	0	3.8	3.5	4.0
Not Currently Enrolled	116	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.6	4.0	4.0
Part-time students	43	3.7	4.0	0	3.4	4.0	4.5
Senior Citizens	32	3.6	4.2	0	3.1	3.8	4.5
High Risk Admissions	20	3.6	4.1	0	3.8	2.0	0
Employed	66	3.5	4.2	2.0	3.4	3.6	3.3
Personal Development	10	3.1	2.3	4.0	4.3	2.3	0
Career Change	14	2.1	3.0	0	2.6	3.0	1
N of program forms for all target groups	742[a]		154	13	303	201	55

[a]Total N of program forms; row total N = 726.

Appendix A: Sampling Procedures

The Attracting and Retaining Adult Learner (ARAL) survey was based on two samples: a national sample of postsecondary institutions and a high-interest sample of institutions that had applied for external funding for programs benefiting adult learners.

The national sample is the same as that used for another ACT national survey conducted in late 1979, which focused on college admissions practices for nontraditional-age freshmen.[5] The population for that sample was defined by all colleges represented in ACT's Institutional Data Questionnaire File.

The sampling was undertaken according to the following schema. Each institution in the file was assigned to a stratum according to whether it had participated in ACT's Predictive Research Services in 1972-73 and in 1977-78, and then further stratified according to the highest degree offered. The file was then sorted on the stratum ID and zip code of each institution. All institutions that had participated in Predictive Research Services in both 1972-73 and 1977-78 were selected (N = 430). Next, a systematic random sample was drawn from each of the degree-level strata (N = 842). These procedures yielded a total general sample of 1,272 institutions. The sample sizes for the strata are displayed in Table 15.

The population for the high-interest sample was defined by those institutions that had submitted an application to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for funding of a demonstration project related to adult learners. All institutions that had made such an application in 1979 were selected for the high-interest sample (N = 396). Of these institutions, 114 had previously been selected for the national sample. In those cases both the institution's president and project director (as identified in the funding application) were sent a copy of the survey. If multiple responses were received from an institution, they were combined prior to the analysis of the data. There were 1,554 (unduplicated) institutions included in the total sample.

---

[5]R. S. Levitz, R. Sawyer, and E. J. Maxey, *College Admissions and Nontraditional-age Freshmen* (Iowa City, Iowa: ACT Report, forthcoming).

TABLE 15

Stratification and Sample Sizes for General Sample

Stratum	ACT Research Participant[1]	Highest Degree Level	Total Number of Schools	Sample Size
1	YES	All Levels	430	430
2	NO	Unknown	71	71
3	NO	2-Year Degree	1110	207
4	NO	Bachelor's	606	194
5	NO	Master's	450	193
6	NO	PhD	218	177
Total	—	—	2885	1272

Note. This sample was drawn initially for ACT's 1979 Admissions Practices Survey—Nontraditional-age Freshmen.

[1]Participated in ACT's Predictive Research Services in 1972-73 and in 1977-78

Appendix B: The ARAL Survey Instrument

Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners (ARAL)

Dear President:

The adult learner population is growing faster than virtually any other segment of higher education. The potential for continued growth, especially in community-based institutions, is nearly limitless. It has been estimated that 40,000,000 adults would return to classroom study if institutions were more responsive to their personal and educational needs.

How can you reach these adult learners and serve their needs effectively?

To help college administrators answer this question, The American College Testing Program (ACT) is conducting a nationwide survey entitled "Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners (ARAL)." The survey is designed to identify, analyze, and report on campus practices that have been successful with adult learners. More than 1,200 selected U.S. institutions are being surveyed.

For a very small investment of staff time, your institution can participate in this important study. To do so, first select the person on your campus who is most knowledgeable about your institution's policies and procedures for attracting and serving adult learners. Then ask that person to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire by April 23.

We hope your institution will join us in the survey. Late this summer, all participating institutions will receive a summary report entitled "What Works in Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners." This report will be a valuable resource tool as you assess and deal with the impact of adult learners on your campus in the 1980s. Better serving adult learners provides postsecondary institutions a significant opportunity to deliver additional community service through meeting crucial human needs. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Survey Directors

Lee G. Noel
Executive Director
ACT National Center for Educational Conferences

Patricia Gartland
Assistant Vice President
Publications and Public Affairs

Pat Spratt
Administrative Assistant
ACT National Center for Educational Conferences

The American College Testing Program, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52243

General Information

1. **Type of institution:**
   a. ___ 4-year public
   b. ___ 4-year private
   c. ___ 2-year public
   d. ___ 2-year private
   e. ___ Other (please specify) _____

2. **Total enrollments as of fall, 1979:**
   a. Full-time _____
   b. Part-time _____

3. **How does your institution define adult students?**
   a. ___ Over twenty-one years of age
   b. ___ Over twenty-five years of age
   c. ___ Other (please specify) _____

4. **Adult enrollments as of fall, 1979:**
   a. Full-time _____
   b. Part-time _____

5. **Has your institution conducted a study of adult dropouts?**
   a. ___ Yes
   b. ___ No

6. **If your institution conducted such a study, what were the three or four main findings? Please attach results; findings will be kept confidential.**

7. **Did your institution determine a dropout rate for adult learners?**
   a. ___ Yes
   b. ___ No
   If yes, please specify results. _____

8. **How did your institution define an adult dropout? If you used different criteria for full-time and part-time adult enrollees, please explain both criteria.**

Programs, Services, and Activities that Serve Adult Needs

9. **In which categories below has your institution provided new or modified services, activities, or curricular offerings to improve recruitment and retention of adult students? Check those categories in which activities have been introduced or restructured in a specific effort to attract and retain the adult student, even if the effort has not been totally successful to date.**
   a. ___ Marketing and recruitment methods (e.g., TV spots; distribution of information at grocery stores and laundromats)
   b. ___ Admissions materials and procedures (e.g., open admissions; simplified procedures for adults)
   c. ___ Orientation sessions and activities (e.g., evening or weekend orientation sessions for adult students only)
   d. ___ Counseling services and programs (e.g., evening hours; special support groups; weekend counseling by appointment)
   e. ___ Registration procedures (e.g., registration by mail)
   f. ___ Academic advising services (e.g., staff includes personnel trained in adult development; expanded hours)
   g. ___ Class scheduling (e.g., expanded hours; weekend degree program; midnight classes for those who work a late shift)
   h. ___ Student services and activities (e.g., adult student resource center; daycare center)
   i. ___ Financial aid (e.g., reduced tuition for senior citizens; scholarship fund for adult students)

j. ___ Career planning services (e.g., career change workshops; evening hours for consultation; career planning workshops before enrollment)

k. ___ Placement services (e.g., how to write a career change resume; services not limited to graduates)

l. ___ Course offerings (e.g., evening and weekend classes for professionals such as journalists, engineers, city administrators)

m. ___ Curricular innovations (e.g., self-designed programs, internships)

n. ___ Faculty training and development (e.g., workshops for faculty on adult development, cognitive learning styles, and successful teaching methods)

o. ___ Administrative structure (e.g., key position which serves as advocate for the adult student, as Vice President for Adult Programs)

p. ___ Assessment of prior learning (e.g., credit by portfolio)

q. ___ Skill development (e.g., special reading and writing labs for adult students; expanded lab hours in evenings and on weekends)

r. ___ Evaluating programs and services (e.g., interviewing formerly enrolled and currently enrolled adults)

s. ___ Funding (e.g., inducing corporations to pay cost of certain courses for their employees; special alumni fund for adult programs)

t. ___ Institutional support (e.g., adult students included in institution's statement of educational mission; adult students part of long-range planning for the institution)

u. ___ Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. From the categories you checked in item 9, select and rank up to five that you consider to be the most essential and productive at your institution. Enter their letters below.

a. ___ Most essential and productive

b. ___ Second most essential and productive

c. ___ Third most essential and productive

d. ___ Fourth most essential and productive

e. ___ Fifth most essential and productive

What Works for You?

The information you provide in item 11 will be crucial to this survey. Using the report form provided, please describe one, three, or nine (or more) new or modified programs, services, or activities that REALLY work on your campus to attract and retain adult learners. Please use a separate form for each description. (Make as many photocopies of the form as you need.) A filled-in sample form appears on the back page of this questionnaire.

11. Please type your responses. Include programs, services, and activities that are exemplary, productive, or innovative. We hope to highlight these efforts nationally. If you give permission, your responses may be incorporated into a monograph or otherwise made available to others.

Definitions:

Category. Name of category taken from item 9 (Marketing and recruitment methods, Admissions materials and procedures, Orientation sessions and activities, and so forth).

Primary Purposes. Reason a new or modified program or service was introduced.

Target Group. The adult student group for whom a particular program or service was designed. The group to which a program was applied: for example, displaced homemakers, mothers with pre-school children, all entering adult students, part-time degree candidates, first-time students, undecided majors, senior citizens.

Description. A brief account of the new program, service, or activity. Include sufficient detail for others to determine interest in further follow-up or consultation.

Thank you very much for responding to this survey. Please feel free to share with us any general comments you might have on the survey or on the topic of attracting and retaining adult learners.

You will receive a summary report of the results of this study.

Using the enclosed postage-paid mailing label, return completed questionnaire and report form(s) by April 23 to:

Dr. Lee G. Noel
ACT National Center
for Educational Conferences
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Study Directors
Lee G. Noel Patricia Gartland Pat Spratt

Report Form **Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners**

Please type. Use a separate form for each description. Please make photocopies if necessary.

Category (See item 9 for category titles)

Academic advising services

Primary Purpose(s)

To let the first-time adult student know about our services.

Target Group

Full-time and part-time adult students who indicated on the registration form that they had never attended a postsecondary institution before.

Description If additional space is needed, continue description on separate sheet.
Along with your completed survey, attach copies of materials you use in each program you have described.

Program was initiated in fall, 1979. We made telephone calls to these students to let them know about our evening and weekend hours, to make them aware of our services, and to invite them to use these services.

In making these calls we found that many adult students had signed up for a course with an "I'll see what happens" attitude. Many did not realize that University personnel were available to help them "learn the ropes."

We were asked many questions that were not applicable to Academic Advising, and made many referrals to both the Career Planning Center and the Counseling Center. In most cases, the students seemed very pleased that someone had taken the time to call them and to show an interest in their return to college.

Two weeks after the phone call we sent a follow-up postcard (attached).

SAMPLE

Satisfaction with success of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

36% of those telephoned made appointments to visit with one of our advisors; of these, 82% enrolled second semester. During the first semester we were contacted by 14 adults who were friends of students we had telephoned. They came "just to find out about courses." 13 of these adults enrolled second semester.

Estimated effectiveness of program Low 1 2 3 (4) 5 High

Please explain:

We would like to increase the number of adult learners served. For those we have served, the results indicate that the program is sound.

May the contents of this form be shared? Yes____ No____

Your name _____ Title _____

Telephone (_____) _____ Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Report Form **Attracting and Retaining Adult Learners**

Please type. Use a separate form for each description. Please make photocopies if necessary.

Category (See item 9 for category titles)

Primary Purpose(s)

Target Group

Description If additional space is needed, continue description on separate sheet.
Along with your completed survey, attach copies of materials you use in each program you have described.

Satisfaction with success of program **Low** 1 2 3 4 5 **High**
Please explain:

Estimated effectiveness of program **Low** 1 2 3 4 5 **High**
Please explain:

May the contents of this form be shared? **Yes**____ **No**____

Your name _____ Title _____

Telephone (_____) _____ Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____